



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

FEB - 9 2015

OFFICE OF
ENFORCEMENT AND
COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE

Mr. Alton Dunaway
Deputy Director, Environmental Compliance
USDA, APHIS Wildlife Services
4700 River Road, Unit 87, Room 2D-07.3
Riverdale, MD 20737-1234

Dear Mr. Dunaway:

In accordance with our authorities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, EPA has reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) Wildlife Services, for the Feral Swine Damage Management Program (FSDM).

The DEIS evaluates strategies to manage threats to human and animal health and addresses the increased damage associated with expanding populations of feral swine. The DEIS considers five alternatives, all of which incorporate State, Territorial and Tribal goals, for managing feral swine. APHIS identified Alternative 2 ("Integrating a nationally coordinated and multi-pronged FSDM response") as the preferred alternative in the DEIS.

Our review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the preferred alternative, and we are rating the proposal as Lack of Objections ("LO") (see enclosed rating sheet). We also recommend that as you develop strategic communication plans and related outreach materials it would be helpful to consider specific methods to improve outreach to low-income and minority populations. Please feel free to contact me or have your staff contact Cliff Rader, Director, NEPA Compliance Division, at (202) 564-7159 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Susan E Bromm". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Susan E. Bromm
Director
Office of Federal Activities

Enclosure

Summary of Rating Definitions and Follow-up Action

Environmental Impact of the Action

LO--Lack of Objections

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC--Environmental Concerns

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EO--Environmental Objections

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU--Environmentally Unsatisfactory

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1--Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2--Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3--Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.